

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Specification, at Page 1, the Applicant has added paragraph pertaining to "Cross-References to Related Applications". Also, the Applicant encloses a replacement Declaration to correct a clerical error as to the type of invention. Instead of a "Continuation", this application is a "Divisional", as typed on the first page of the specification as filed. The Applicant submits that these amendments introduces no new matter.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable by a combination of Minami, Andjelic, Boss and Scarlata.

Claim 1 includes the limitation that pages are conveyed past a glue station that applies a line of glue to the page, the line of glue being transverse to the paper path. In the citations, the Examiner has relied on Scarlata as describing this feature.

Scarlata describes a copying apparatus in which a printed page is ejected onto a compiler tray to form a stack of documents. An adhesive application station is provided in conjunction with the compiler tray. As individual pages are loaded onto the tray, they receive a line of adhesive along an edge of the page. The line of adhesive is transverse to the direction from which the pages were received onto the tray. In Scarlata, the adhesive station constitutes the end of the paper path with the adhesive station being disposed above the tray. Individual pages are received between the adhesive application station and the tray.

In contrast, the present invention describes an apparatus in which individual pages are conveyed along a path *past* an adhesive application station where they receive a line of adhesive transverse to the direction of the path. Thereafter, the individual pages continue to be conveyed to a document support tray where they are pressed to bond the pages together. That the pages continue to be conveyed along a paper path after receiving the adhesive is a significant distinction over Scarlata. This design allows adhesive to be provided to either or both sides of the page, which is particularly advantageous where two part adhesives are used, as described in methods 3, 4 and 5 commencing at page 6, lines 17 of the description. Because the adhesive applicator of Scarlata is disposed at the terminus of the paper path, the adhesive applicator can provide adhesive to one side of the page only. Where adhesive is applied to one side of a page only, the present invention provides greater flexibility in determining which side of the page will receive the adhesive, which may vary depending on the application.

To highlight this distinction, present claim 1 has been amended to now define that the pages are conveyed individually to the glue dispenser, and then conveyed individually from the glue dispenser to a document support. These features are not taught by Scarlata.

Minami describes an apparatus where pages are conveyed individually past an adhesive application station, and thence conveyed individually to a document support station where they are pressed. The adhesive applicator is a point source, with the line of adhesive being created as the page moves along the path past the applicator. The line of adhesive is therefore in a direction parallel to the direction of the paper path. As discussed, present claim 1 requires that the adhesive is applied in a line transverse to the direction of the paper path. Therefore, Minami alone does not teach the features of claim 1 of a method of binding where adhesive is applied along a line of the page transverse to the direction of the paper path and where the page is then conveyed to a document support.

In anticipation of a rejection combining references Minami and Scarlata, Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to the skilled addressee to combine Minami and Scarlata to thereby achieve an apparatus where adhesive is applied in a line transverse to the direction of a paper path at an adhesive application station located at an intermediate position along the paper path. The device described by Scarlata only works because it is disposed at the end of the paper path when the page is stationary. The Minami device works because the page moves continuously through the apparatus. The Scarlata and Minami devices are therefore not compatible, and the structure required to make the device of Scarlata work at an intermediate position along the paper path is not apparent from either Scarlata or from Minami. Therefore a combination of Minami and Scarlata would not be obvious to the ordinary skilled worker in the art, nor would such a combination provide a useful solution that anticipates the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention defined by claim 1 is patentably distinct from Scarlata and Minami, either in isolation or in combination.

Whilst Boss and Andjelic each teach some form of adhesive binding of pages, they have not been relied on by the Examiner as teaching aspects of the adhesive application station relevant to the present claims. Specifically, Boss describes a pressing stack for pressing a stack of pages to which adhesive has already been applied. No description of how the adhesive is applied to the pages is provided. Andjelic describes a system for stitching pages, with adhesive being applied along the outer edges or spine of a page stack prior to providing a binding cover to the page stack. No adhesive is applied to the pages prior to the pages reaching the stack. Accordingly, combinations of Minami and Scarlata with either or both of Boss and Andjelic do not teach the method claimed in which a line of adhesive is applied in a direction transverse to the paper path, and thereafter the page is conveyed to a document support.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 1 is novel and inventive over all combinations of references presently cited by the Examiner. Applicant further submits that claim 2, being dependent on claim 1, is novel and inventive over all combinations of references presently cited by extension of the arguments advance above.

Applicant contends that this response is fully responsive to each of the issues raised in the Office Action. Noting the finality of the Office Action, Applicant further submits that the amendments made herein clearly distinguish the present invention from the prior art and place the application in order for allowance. Further consideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762